



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,649	04/13/2001	Satoshi Okamoto	0879-0310P	1743
2292	7590	02/04/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			2622	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/04/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/833,649	Applicant(s) OKAMOTO, SATOSHI
	Examiner YOGESH K. AGGARWAL	Art Unit 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14, 16-45 and 47-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14, 16-45 and 47-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 64 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CC)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16-45 and 47-64 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield et al. (US Patent # 5,555,100) and in further view of Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354).

[Claim 1]

Suzuki teaches an image data transmitting device (figure 1, digital camera) comprising:

an information processing device (16) that creates a reduced image data based on a subject main image data, and stores an image file including the subject main image data and the reduced image data in a storage medium (See figure 11, col. 12 lines 48-64) and

a communication device (19) that transmits the image file stored in the storage medium to an external apparatus (receiving side, figure 36, col. 19 line 59-col. 20 line 12).

Suzuki fails to teach wherein the information processing device deletes from the image file in the storage medium the subject main image data after the communication device transmits

the image file data and keeps the reduced image data of the image file after the subject main image data is deleted.

However Bloomfield teaches that a stored image information that has been transmitted to the destination is deleted from the storage database and only a reduced image is created (col. 75 lines 47-56, figure 90).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki and Bloomfield, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have the deleted the image file in the storage medium after the communication device transmits the image file data and keeps the reduced image data of the image file in the system of Suzuki as taught in Bloomfield in order to only store the reduced image (thumbnail) in the memory of Suzuki so that the memory capacity can be efficiently used for taking next photograph by only storing a reduced version of the original image that has been already transmitted thereby not missing a photographic opportunity.

Suzuki in view of Bloomfield fails to teach wherein the information processing device adds information to the reduced image data, the added information indicating the main image data has been transmitted, the added information identifying the external apparatus to which the main image has been transmitted, or the added information indicating the main image data has been stored, the added information identifying a location of the storage.

However Kawamura teaches that when the data transfer was normally finished (when YES is obtained in step S14), the microcomputer 15 links the transferred item of recorded information with a PC icon 52 by affixing the PC icon 52 to a thumbnail image of the transferred item of recorded information as shown in FIG. 6, and displays the icon 52 along with this

thumbnail image (col. 6 lines 51-57). Therefore by adding the PC icon to the thumbnail image data, it is communicated to the user that the main image has been transmitted to the PC, thus identifying the external apparatus or the added information i.e. PC icon also indicates that the main image data has been stored, the added information identifying a location of the storage i.e. PC.

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield and Kawamura, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have information processing device adds information to the reduced image data, the added information indicating the main image data has been transmitted, the added information identifying the external apparatus to which the main image has been transmitted, or the added information indicating the main image data has been stored, the added information identifying a location of the storage into the system of Suzuki in view of Bloomfield in order for the user to easily know that the image has been transmitted to an external device thereby making the system user-friendly.

[Claim 3]

Suzuki teaches a system controller 16 that controls the data and the whole process when the camera is connected to an external device.

[Claim 4]

Suzuki in view of Bloomfield and Kawamura fails to teach transmitting images automatically to an external device (figure 37). However official Notice is taken that it is very well known to transmit images automatically in order to complete the process of transmission quickly thereby saving time. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield and Kawamura, it

would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have transmitted images automatically in order to complete the process of transmission quickly thereby saving time

[Claim 14]

Suzuki teaches an imaging device (figure 1, imaging circuit 2) that captures the main image data, wherein the main image data is stored in the storage medium (memory card 15).

[Claims 30, 32, 33]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 1, 3 and 4 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 1, 3 and 4.

4. Claims 2 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354) and in further view of Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870).

[Claim 2]

Suzuki, Bloomfield in view of Kawamura fails to teach a user setting erasure setting for the images. However Nanba teaches a delete key D for deleting the images recorded in the memory card 8 (col. 3 lines 43-46, figure 1). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a delete key may be pressed at any time by a user e.g. after the communication device transmits the main image data to the external apparatus. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura and Nanba, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have user setting erasure setting for the images in order to delete the images according to the user's commands.

[Claim 31]

This is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 2. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claim 2.

5. Claims 5, 6, 34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354) and in further view of Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125).

[Claims 5 and 6]

Suzuki in view of Bloomfield fails to teach wherein the information-processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted. However Tamura teaches wherein the information processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted (Paragraph 23, figure 5). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura and Tamura, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have added an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted in order for the user to easily distinguish the transmitted files.

[Claims 34, 38]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 5 and 6 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 5 and 6.

6. Claims 7-11, 35-37, 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354), Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125) and in further view of Tomat et al. (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claims 7, 10 and 11]

Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura in view of Tamura teaches the limitations of claim 6 but fails to teach “further comprising a first displaying device that displays a reduced image with at least one of information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus and an information processing device that adds the information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus”. However Tomat et al. teaches that a displaying device (figure 22, element 190) that displays thumbnail images (192) along with information like an acquired icon 224 (figure 24) which indicates the type of the device from where the information can be downloaded and that the main image (col. 15 lines 66-67, col. 16 lines 1-10) and numeral 212 (figure 23) that indicates that indicates which photogroup the picture belongs to. In other words, whether the main image has been transmitted from the camera or any other external device. The PC or camera inherently have a CPU which adds the icons (224 and 212) associated with the thumbnail images 192. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura, Tamura and Tomat et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a first displaying device that displays a reduced image with at least one of information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus and an information processing device that adds the information that the main image data has been transmitted, and information indicating the external apparatus. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can easily verify the source of the images and auto-correct the images by looking at the icons associated with the thumbnail images.

[Claim 8]

Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura in view of Tamura teaches the limitations of claim 6 but fails to teach “a third setting device with which the user sets reception of the main image data according to the reduced image data stored in the storage medium, wherein the communication device receives the main image data from the external apparatus and stores the main image data in the storage medium”. However Tomat et al. teaches that a displaying device (figure 22, element 190) that displays thumbnail images (in area 192) that is selected and will cause a full-resolution image associated with it to be copied to the storage device (col. 16 lines 11-20) after downloading from the digital camera in order to view the main image corresponding to the thumbnail image. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura, Tamura and Tomat et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a first displaying device that displays a reduced image and a setting device with which the user sets reception of the main image data according to the reduced image data stored in the storage medium, wherein the communication device receives the main image data from the external apparatus and stores the main image data in the storage medium. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can easily manipulate images and view them based on the thumbnail images.

[Claim 9]

Tomat teaches that after the full resolution file is moved to a storage device (along with associated information) the corresponding photogroup is deleted from the camera so that the CPU replaces the previous information that the main image has been transmitted (col. 16 lines 11-27).

[Claims 35-37]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 7-9 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 7-9.

[Claims 39-43]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 7-11 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 7-11.

7. Claims 12, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354) and in further view of Allen et al. (US Patent # 5,737,491).

[Claim 12]

Suzuki, Bloomfield in view of Kawamura teaches the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach “a fourth setting device with which the user sets transmission of the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus, wherein the information processing device produces a transmission information file that shows information set with the fourth setting device, and the communication device transmits the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus according to the information shown in the transmission information file”.

However Allen et al. teaches an image file being appended to the digitized voice command header and transmitted to the image fulfillment server where it is compared and decoded based on the appended voice file (col. 5 lines 6-17) in order to decode the image file. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura and Allen, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a device with which the user sets transmission of the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus, wherein the information processing device produces a

Art Unit: 2622

transmission information file that shows information set with the setting device, and the communication device transmits the main image data stored in the storage medium to the external apparatus according to the information shown in the transmission information file. The benefit of doing so would be to have the image file decoded by the external apparatus according to the transmission file generated by the transmission device.

[Claim 44]

This is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 12. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claim 12.

8. Claims 13, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354) and in further in view of Oie (US Patent # 6,188,431).

[Claim 13]

Suzuki, Bloomfield in view of Kawamura teaches the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach “a second displaying device that displays a message that the main image data is being transmitted while the communication device is transmitting the main image data to the external apparatus”. However Oie teaches that during image transmission the message “WAIT” indicating that the image data is currently being transferred appears on the LCD (col. 6 lines 25-36) in order to inform the user that the file is being transmitted. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura and Oie, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a second displaying device that displays a message that the main image data is being transmitted while the communication device is

Art Unit: 2622

transmitting the main image data to the external apparatus. The benefit of doing so would be so that the user can know if the file has been transmitted successfully.

[Claim 45]

This is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 13. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claim 13.

9. Claims 16-21, 29, 47-51 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354), Nanba (US Patent # 6,297,870) in view of Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440).

[Claim 16]

Suzuki, Bloomfield in view of Kawamura teaches the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach “a user setting erasure setting for the images and whereby the reduced image data is produced simultaneously with production and deletion of main image data”.

However Nanba teaches a delete key D for deleting the images recorded in the memory card 8 (col. 3 lines 43-46, figure 1).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura and Nanba, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have user setting erasure setting for the images in order to delete the images according to the user's commands.

Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura in view of Nanba fails to teach whereby the reduced image data is produced simultaneously with production of main image data.

However Niikawa teaches the generation of thumbnail image data and main image data in a single file, which must be generated or deleted simultaneously in order to conform to the EXIF standard (Paragraph 41 and figure 3).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura, Nanba and Niikawa, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the reduced image data be produced simultaneously with production of main image data in order to conform with EXIF standard. The benefit of doing so would be to store both the low-resolution and high-resolution data together in an EXIF file format.

[Claims 17-21, 29]

These claims are similar to claims 2-6, 14. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 2-6, 14.

[Claims 47-51]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 16-20 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 16-20.

[Claim 55]

This claim is similar to claim 38. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 38.

10. Claims 22-26, 52-54, 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354), Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Tomat et al. (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claims 22-26]

These claims are similar to claims 7-11. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 7-11.

[Claims 52-54]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 22-24 respectively. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon apparatus claims 22-24.

[Claims 56-60]

These claims are similar to claims 39-43. Therefore they have been analyzed and rejected based upon claims 39-43.

11. Claims 27, 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354), Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Allen et al. (US Patent # 5,737,491).

[Claim 27]

This claim is similar to claim 12. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 12.

[Claim 61]

This claim is similar to claim 44. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 44.

12. Claims 28, 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354) and Niikawa et al. (US PG-PUB # 2002/0101440) and in further view of Oie (US Patent # 6,784,925).

[Claim 28]

This claim is similar to claim 13. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 13.

[Claim 62]

This claim is similar to claim 45. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon claim 45.

13. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent # 5,724,579), Bloomfield (US Patent # 5,555,100), Kawamura et al. (US Patent # 6,522,354) and further in view of Tamura (JP Patent # 09-37125).

[Claim 63]

Suzuki, Bloomfield in view of Kawamura teaches an image data processing device (Suzuki, figure 1, camera), a transmission device (19) that transmits at least said basic image data to an external device.

Suzuki, Bloomfield in view of Kawamura fails to teach wherein the information-processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted. However Tamura teaches wherein the information processing device adds an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted (Paragraph 23, figure 5). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Suzuki, Bloomfield, Kawamura and Tamura, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have added an indicator indicating that the main image data has been transmitted to a file name of a file of the main image data transmitted in order for the user to easily distinguish the transmitted files.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claim 64 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOGESH K. AGGARWAL whose telephone number is (571)272-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571)-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YKA
January 28, 2009

/Sinh N Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622